

**APPELLATE COURT
STATE OF CONNECTICUT**

A.C. NO.: 42602	:	APPELLATE COURT
	:	
MERIBEAR PRODUCTIONS, INC. d/b/a	:	
MERIDETH BAER AND ASSOCIATES	:	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
	:	
V.	:	
	:	
JOAN FRANK, ET AL.	:	FEBRUARY 22, 2019

MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL

The Appellee, Meribear Productions, Inc. (hereinafter "Meribear"), hereby moves pursuant to Practice Book § 66-8 that the Appeal filed on February 15, 2019 be dismissed. Specifically, this Court lacks jurisdiction to entertain the appeal by virtue of the fact that this is a joint appeal, filed by Joan Frank and George Frank, wherein the final judgment from which Joan Frank appeals was rendered on October 14, 2014. Accordingly, this joint appeal is late and subject to dismissal as untimely.

I. BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CASE

Meribear is a California corporation in the business of, *inter alia*, providing interior design and staging services to facilitate their clients' sale of real estate. The Defendants/Appellants, Joan and George (a/k/a Andy) Frank, are individuals who at all times relevant hereto owned or had an interest in real estate known as 3 Cooper Lane, Westport, Connecticut (the "Premises"). The Franks hired Meribear to stage the Premises in order to give it a "showroom like quality" in conjunction with their placing the Premises on the residential real estate market in order to sell it.

On March 13, 2011, Meribear and the Franks entered into the "Staging Services and Lease Agreement" the Franks' breach of which formed the basis of the underlying dispute.

The sole purpose of the agreement was to have Meribear design, decorate, deliver and install rental furnishings, including high-end antiques and art, at the Premises in order to facilitate the sale of the Premises. In fact, it was the Defendants' Realtor, Jillian Klaff, who was working to sell 3 Cooper Lane, who contacted Mr. Baer directly and requested that he put together a proposal for staging the house.

The Contract also provided that in exchange for its work, Meribear was to receive payment according to the Contract terms. Notwithstanding, and despite the fact that Meribear fully performed its obligations, the Franks failed, refused or neglected to make payment and thereby breached the Contract. Moreover, the Franks interfered with and prevented Meribear from removing the furnishings after the Franks' breach, thereby causing Meribear to suffer additional damages. In fact, the Franks have wrongfully retained – and continue to this day to retain - possession of Meribear's goods.

On February 15, 2012, Meribear filed suit in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, claiming, *inter alia*, breach of contract and conversion ("California Action"). Meribear served process on both of the Franks in conformance with the Laws of the State of California. Ultimately, on August 7, 2012, after determining that Meribear had complied with the laws and requirements of the State of California, a Default Judgment ("Judgment") was entered in the California Superior Court, County of Los Angeles against Joan and George Frank and in favor of the Plaintiff in the amount of \$259,746.10.

The Judgment remaining entirely unpaid, Meribear commenced suit in the Superior Court for the Judicial District of Fairfield at Bridgeport in order to enforce the Judgment. Meribear claimed enforcement of the Judgment in the First Count and, in the alternative, conversion damages for breach of the underlying Contract in the Second Count and

damages in Quantum Meruit in the Third Count. The trial of this case was conducted on March 27, 2013 and April 24, 2013 before the Honorable Theodore Tyma.

On October 14, 2014, the Trial Court rendered an extremely thorough, well-reasoned Memorandum of Decision. In it the court found constructive service had been properly made on George Frank who was an owner of the company and routinely present at the office. Accordingly, the court found in Plaintiff's favor for common law enforcement of the Judgment against George Frank, but not against Joan Frank. With regard to the breach of contract claim, the court found in Plaintiff's favor as to both Joan and George Frank, specifically finding "the plaintiff's evidence relevant to the claimed breach to be credible, and the defendants' evidence not credible." In fact, the court expressly stated that it "*found George Frank's testimony on the procedural and substantive issues to be manufactured and lacking in truthfulness.*" (emphasis added). The Court rejected the Franks' Special Defenses, including that C.G.S. § 42-134a, the Home Solicitation Sales Act ("HSSA"), barred enforcement of the contract or that jurisdiction was lacking.

On or about December 18, 2014, the Defendants filed an appeal. By decision dated May 10, 2016, the Appellate Court affirmed the trial court's decision in favor of Meribear. Meribear Productions, Inc. v. Joan E. Frank et. al, 165 Conn.App. 305 (2016). Specifically, it found, *inter alia*, that Andy Frank had contractually consented to personal jurisdiction, that the contract at issue was not governed by the HSSA, and that the damages awarded were proper. On May 31, 2016, the Franks filed their Petition for Certification to Appeal to which Meribear objected. The Supreme Court thereafter granted certification to appeal.

By Memorandum of Decision released on May 15, 2018, the Supreme Court determined that the Appellants' joint appeal of December 18, 2014 was improper and that

the decision should be reversed and remanded with direction to the Appellate Court to dismiss the appeal because that Court lacked jurisdiction. Meribear Productions, Inc. v. Joan E. Frank et al., 328 Conn. 709, 726 (2018). Specifically, the Supreme Court concluded that although the judgment was final as to Joan Frank, Id. at 724; Id. at 726, FN 4; it was not final as to George Frank. Id. at 725. The Court determined that because the trial court failed to dispose of either the contract count (Count 2) or the quantum meruit count (Count 3) as to George Frank, those counts were not legally inconsistent alternative theories of liability, there was no final judgment as to George Frank from which to appeal and therefore the joint appeal required dismissal. Id. at 723-25. In its decision, the Supreme Court all but informed the Appellants that the appeals should have been taken separately. The appeal was thereafter dismissed.

On or about October 2, 2018, the Plaintiff filed a Motion for Attorney's Fees in the trial court as well as a Motion for Post Judgment Interest. On January 29, 2019, Meribear filed a withdrawal of Counts 2 and 3 of its Complaint as to George Frank. The Motions for Attorney's Fees and Post Judgment Interest were argued on January 30, 2019. The parties stipulated and the trial court confirmed that an award of Attorney's Fees in the amount of \$66,410.00 would enter. On or about January 31, 2019, the trial court issued a written decision granting Meribear an award of Post Judgment Interest in the amount of five percent (5%).¹ Neither action by the Court affects the finality of the judgment here at issue.

¹ [A] judgment on the merits is final for purposes of appeal even though the recoverability or amount of attorney's fees [or interest] for the litigation remains to be determined. Hylton v. Gunter, 313 Conn. 472, 478-79 (2014).

On or about February 15, 2019, Joan Frank and George Frank filed the instant joint appeal to which this Motion to Dismiss is addressed. Again, the appeal was taken jointly. This Motion to Dismiss is timely, filed within 10 days of the filing of the joint appeal.

II. SPECIFIC FACTS ON WHICH MOVANT RELIES

In support of this Motion to Dismiss the joint appeal, Meribear relies on the fact that the time for Joan Frank to appeal has long expired, the judgment against her having been entered on October 14, 2014. Accordingly, the Franks' joint appeal is subject to a similar infirmity as their first: namely, that a non-appealable judgment as to one appellant renders the entire appeal improper and subject to dismissal.

III. LEGAL GROUNDS FOR MOTION

This Motion to Dismiss Appeal should be granted because the decision as to Joan Frank was conclusively determined by the Supreme Court to have entered in December 2014:

Applying these rules to the present case, we conclude that the judgment as to Joan Frank was final. The trial court expressly disposed of counts one and two as to her. Counts two and three alleged mutually exclusive theories.

Meribear Productions, Inc. v. Joan E. Frank et al., 328 Conn. at 724. Just as the lack of a final judgment as to George Frank rendered the initial joint appeal improper in its entirety, so too is the present joint appeal improper due to the fact that one of the judgments from which appeal is taken is well outside the 20 day time limit for filing an appeal. Accordingly, the joint appeal is untimely, and therefore, appropriately dismissed in its entirety.

“[W]hen a motion to dismiss that raises untimeliness is, itself, timely filed pursuant to Practice Book § 4056 [now § 66–8], it is ordinarily our practice to dismiss the appeal if it is

in fact late, and if no reason readily appears on the record to warrant an exception to our general rule. This practice is based in part on the fact that if the untimely appeal is entertained, a delinquent appellant would obtain the benefit of the appellate process after contributing to its delay, to the detriment of others with appeals pending who have complied with the rules and have a right to have their appeals determined expeditiously. Appellees are given the right under our rules to object to the filing of a late appeal and should be given the benefit of that rule, barring unusual circumstances or unless they waive the benefit of that rule. See, Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Hillcrest Associates, 223 Conn. 153, 173 (1995). We ordinarily dismiss late appeals that are the subject of timely motions to dismiss, knowing also that our discretion can be tempered by Practice Book § 4183(6) [now § 60–2(6)], which provides for the filing of late appeals for good cause shown.” Nicoll v. State, 38 Conn.App. 333, 335-36 (1995).

The Supreme Court’s decision in this very matter all but informed the Appellants that the appeal from the October 14, 2014 judgment should have been filed separately, or that they could have, but failed, to request that the Court consider them separately should it conclude that the judgment as to George Frank was not final. Id. at 726, FN 4. Similarly here, despite the Supreme Court’s holding, the Appellants have filed a joint appeal which by its nature renders an infirmity as to one Appellant an infirmity as to both and there is no good cause on which to permit this late appeal to proceed some five years after judgment. Accordingly, the appeal is late, would prejudice Meribear should it be permitted to proceed, and should be dismissed.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons asserted herein, the Court should grant this Motion to Dismiss the Joint Appeal.

THE PLAINTIFF,

MERIBEAR PRODUCTIONS, INC. d/b/a
MERIDITH BAER and ASSOCIATES,


By:



Anthony J. LaBella, Esquire
Ury & Moskow, L.L.C.
883 Black Rock Turnpike
Fairfield, CT 06825
(203) 610-6393 (p) / (203) 610-6399 (f)
Anthony@urymoskow.com

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this motion complies with P.B. § 66-3.



Anthony J. LaBella
Commissioner of the Superior Court

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that on February 22, 2019, pursuant to Connecticut Rule of Appellate procedure § 62-7, that:

- (1) The electronically submitted Motion to Dismiss (hereinafter "Motion") was delivered electronically to the last known e-mail address of each counsel of record for whom an e-mail address was provided; and
- (2) The electronically submitted Motion and the filed paper have been redacted or do not contain any names or other personal identifying information that is prohibited from disclosure by rule, statute, court order, or case law; and
- (3) A copy of the Motion was sent to each counsel of record and to any trial judge who rendered a decision that is the subject matter of the appeal as indicated below, in compliance with § 62-7; and
- (4) The Motion filed with the appellate clerk is a true copy of the Motion that was submitted electronically; and
- (5) The Motion complies with all provisions of this rule.

Courtesy Copy:
Chambers of the Honorable
Theodore R. Tyma
1061 Main Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604

Christopher C. Vaughn, Esq.
160 Fairfield Woods Road
Suite 14
Fairfield, CT 06825
203-581-4298 (p)
ccvaugh@gmail.com

Michael S. Taylor, Esq.
Horton, Dowd, Bartschi & Levesque, P.C.
90 Gillett Street
Hartford, CT 06106
(860) 522-8838 (p) / (860) 728-0401 (f)
mtaylor@hdblfirm.com



Anthony J. LaBella, Esq.
Commissioner of the Superior Court